UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/099,799	03/15/2002	Patrick S. Botz	POU901164US1	4349

46369 7590 01/17/2006

HESLIN ROTHENBERG FARLEY & MESITI P.C.
5 COLUMBIA CIRCLE
ALBANY, NY 12203

EXAMINER	
PEARSON, DAVID J	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2137	

DATE MAILED: 01/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/099,799	BOTZ ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	David J. Pearson	2137	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *10 November 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *See Continuation Sheet* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *See Continuation Sheet* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-6,9-11,13,16-21,23-27,29-32,35-37,39,42-47,49-59,62-64,66,69-74 and 76-79* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *15 March 2002* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Continuation of Disposition of Claims: Claims pending in the application are 1,3-6,9-11,13,16-21,23-27,29-32,35-37,39,42-47,49-59,62-64,66,69-74 and 76-79.
Continuation of Disposition of Claims: Claims withdrawn from consideration are 2,7,8,12,14,15,22,28,33,34,38,40,41,48,55,60,61,65,67,68 and 75.

1. Claims 1,3-6,9-11,13,16-21,23-27,29-32,35-37,39,42-47,49-59,62-64,66,69-74 and 76-79 are pending and have been examined.

2. Claims 2,7,8,12,14,15,22,28,33,34,38,40,41,48,55,60,61,65,67,68 and 75 have been canceled.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1,3-6,9-11,13,16-21,23-27,29-32,35-37,39,42-47,49-59,62-64,66,69-74 and 76-79 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

4. Claims 1,3-6,9-11,13,16-21,23-27,29-32,35-37,39,42-47,49-59,62-64,66,69-74 and 76-79 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Makower et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0184507), and further in view of Cuomo et al (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0091757).

For claims 1, 27, 53 and 54, Makower et al. teach an authenticated identity translation system comprising: means for establishing an authenticated user identity **at an initial server** responsive to an identification and authentication event (note paragraph [0032]) within a domain (note paragraph [0016]) comprising **said** initial

server and **at least one** subsequent **server** (note paragraph [0020]), said identification and authentication event occurring at said initial **server** (note paragraph [0031]), said **server** unit and said **at least one** subsequent **server** employing disparate user registries with different user identities (note paragraph [0035]), **said disparate user registries being separately maintained by the servers and being logically represented in a global registry maintained by a domain controller, said global registry including information that establishes a correspondence between a user identity in the initial server with a corresponding, local user identity within the at least one subsequent server** (note the last sentence of paragraph [0035]); means for generating a **translation** token representative of said identification and authentication event (note paragraph [0033]) **and providing said translation token to said domain controller** (note paragraph [0033]), **storing said translation token by said domain controller and obtaining a token reference from said domain controller, said token reference comprising an index to said stored translation token within said domain controller** (note paragraph [0033]); **and** means for translating the authentication user identity of said **server** unit to a local user identity of said **at least one** subsequent **server** (note paragraph [0036]), wherein said **at least one** subsequent **server** initiates said translating employing said token **reference, said translating comprising: forwarding said token reference to said domain controller** (note paragraph [0030]), **and employing said token reference at the domain controller to retrieve said translation token and translate the authenticated user identify of said initial server to the local user identity of said at least one subsequent server**

employing said global registry of said corresponding user identities maintained by the domain controller.(note paragraphs [0035] and [0036]).

Makower et al. differ from the claimed invention in that they fail to specify **means for forwarding said token reference from the initial server to said at least one subsequent server along with a request; and the domain controller receives the token reference from the at least one subsequent server.**

Cuomo et al. teach **means for forwarding said token reference from the initial server to said at least one subsequent server along with a request; and the domain controller receives the token reference from the at least one subsequent server** (note paragraph [0009]).

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to combine the system of Makower et al. with the proxy system of Cuomo et al. making the web servers of Makower et al. also act as proxies for the cookie exchange between the client browser and the central sign-on server because it would increase the security of the system because the central sign-on server would no longer be directly accessible from the outside world.

For claims 3, 29 and 56, the combination of Makower et al. and Cuomo et al. teaches the method of claims **1, 27 and 54**, wherein, said translation token **includes** at least some of an identity of the initial **server**, a user identity, and a time stamp representative of time of authentication (note paragraph [0031] of Makower et al.).

For claims 4, 30 and 57, the combination of Makower et al. and Cuomo et al. teaches the method of claims 3, 29 and 56 wherein said generating further comprises obtaining signing value pair information from the domain controller, and signing the translation token using said signing value pair (note paragraph [0033] of Makower et al.).

For claims 5, 31 and 58, the combination of Makower et al. and Cuomo et al. teaches the method of claims 4, 30 and 57 wherein said translating by the domain controller further comprises validating the translation token signature prior to said translating of the authenticated user identity to the local user identity using the global registry of different user identities (note paragraph [0034] of Makower et al.).

For claims 6, 32 and 59, the combination of Makower et al. and Cuomo et al. teaches the method of claims 5, 31 and 58 wherein said signing value pair comprises a signing value and a sequence number (note paragraph [0028] of Makower et al.), and wherein said sequence number is encrypted by the domain controller employing an encryption key known only to the domain controller (note paragraph [0031] of Makower et al.), and said validating includes employing the encryption key to validate the translation token (note paragraph [0035] of Makower et al.).

For claims 9, 35 and 62, the combination of Makower et al and Cuomo et al. teaches a method of claims **1, 27 and 54** further comprising authenticating the local

user identity at the **at least one** subsequent **server**, said authentication being based on a return code received from the domain controller with the local user identity, said return code being based on at least one authentication policy for the domain (note paragraphs [0036] and [0037]) of Makower et al.).

For claims 10, 36 and 63, the combination of Makower et al. and Cuomo et al. teaches a method of claims 9, 35 and 62 wherein said at least one authentication policy is user dependent or method of authentication dependent for said **at least one** subsequent **server**, and wherein the method of authentication comprises a method of authentication employed by said means for establishing of said authenticated user identity at said initial **server** (note paragraphs [0020], [0032] and [0037] of Makower et al.).

For claims 11, 37 and 64, the combination of Makower et al. and Cuomo et al. teaches a method of claims 1, 27 and 54 further comprising means for repeating said method for at least one additional subsequent **server** (note paragraph [0020] of Makower et al.), wherein with each repeating, said **at least one** subsequent **server** becomes said initial **server** and said at least one additional subsequent **server** becomes said **at least one** subsequent **server** (note paragraph [0034] of Makower et al.), wherein said domain controller is employed by each at least one additional subsequent **server** in translating the token to a respective local user identity (note paragraph [0022] of Makower et al.).

For claims 13, 39 and 66, the combination of Makower et al. and Cuomo et al. teaches the domain comprises a trust domain, and wherein the method further comprises initially establishing said trust domain within which the authenticated identity translation is to occur (note paragraphs [0021] and [0022] of Cuomo et al.).

For claims 16, 42 and 69, the combination of Makower et al. and Cuomo et al. teaches said method further comprises one of means for forwarding the token to the **at least one** subsequent **server** directly from the initial **server** or means for forwarding the token from the initial **server** through a user of the initial **server** to the **at least one** subsequent **server** (note paragraph [0009] of Cuomo et al and paragraphs [0030] [0031] and [0038] of Makower et al.).

For claims 17, 43 and 70, the combination of Makower et al. and Cuomo et al. teaches the initial **server** and the **at least one** subsequent **server** reside in different partitions of a multi-partition computing environment (note paragraph [0021] of Makower et al.).

For claims 18, 44 and 71, the combination of Makower et al. and Cuomo et al. teaches the method of claims 1, 27 and 54 wherein the initial **server** is also another subsequent **server** to a further initial **server** establishing another authenticated user identity (note paragraph [0035] of Makower et al.).

For claims 19, 45 and 72, the combination of Makower et al. and Cuomo et al. teaches the method of claims 18, 44 and 71 wherein the **at least one** subsequent **server** comprises said further initial **server** (note paragraph [0035] of Makower et al.).

For claims 20, 46 and 73, the combination of Makower et al. and Cuomo et al. teaches the method of claims 1, 27 and 54 further comprising means for repeating said method for multiple users, employing multiple initial **servers**, each requiring access to at least one subsequent **server** (note paragraph [0026] of Makower et al.).

For claims 21, 47 and 74, the combination of Makower et al. and Cuomo et al. teaches said domain comprises a heterogeneous computing network (note FIG. 1 of Makower et al.), and wherein said initial **server** and said **at least one** subsequent **server** comprise heterogeneous computing units (note paragraph [0015] of Makower et al.).

For claims 23, 49 and 76, the combination of Makower et al. and Cuomo et al. teaches the means for generating further comprises securing the token **reference** against modification prior to said forwarding of the token **reference** to said **at least one** subsequent **server** (note paragraph [0031] of Makower et al.).

For claims 24, 50 and 77, examiner takes official notice that the structure of the token is programmable by the administrator of the domain.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have the structure of the token be programmable by the administrator of the domain. It is well known in the art to give administrators the option to customize the security elements of a network in order to create a network that is best suited for their needs.

For claims 25, 51 and 78, the combination of Makower et al. and Cuomo et al. teaches the method of claims 1, 27 and 54, wherein said method further comprises performing by the domain controller at least one of retiring the token or purging the token subsequent to said translating (note paragraph [0045] of Makower et al.).

For claims 26, 52 and 79, the combination of Makower et al. teach and Cuomo et al. teach the methods of 1, 27 and 54, wherein said method further comprises means for employing a secure protocol to transfer **said** request and said token **reference** from said initial **server** to **at least one** said subsequent **server** (note paragraph [0022] of Makower et al.).

Conclusion

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David J. Pearson whose telephone number is (571) 272-0711. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8:00am - 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on (571) 272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

/

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

DJP

EMMANUEL L. MOISE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER